



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

PRIESTS AND WORSHIP IN THE LAST DECADE OF THE TEMPLE AT JERUSALEM.

PROFESSOR Adolf Büchler of Vienna has written a highly estimable work on the Priests and Worship in the last decade of the Temple in Jerusalem¹, which, by reason of its wealth of new ideas and importance, is in many respects subject to criticism. As far as I know, two scientific reviews, both entering into details, have thus far appeared; one by Herr A. Epstein², and another by Prof. L. Blau³. In the following remarks I do not intend to discuss Prof. Büchler's work, but to produce some data referring to this subject, which I hope will serve to throw light upon the last decade of the Temple of Jerusalem in its many phases.

It has already been pointed out by Herr Epstein, that Prof. Büchler's investigations are especially instructive in reference to the schools in Jabne and Lydda. Among other things Prof. Büchler mentions certain Tannaites, whose name is introduced by the word **אבן**. Prof. Büchler considers this title to be quite obscure (p. 92). This title is, however, so frequently met with that it does not sound at all unfamiliar. The point may be characterized as a sort of *bon mot*, not rare among Talmudists; namely, a question which is only put because the questioner has a good answer *in petto*. Prof. Büchler asks the question only because he thinks he has a good answer to give; namely, he is of opinion that such Doctors of the Law had stood "in relations" to the sanctuary in Jerusalem. Prof. Büchler quotes even Matthew xxiii. 9⁴, where this title also occurs in Greek (πάτερ); consequently, the meaning is at least not obscure. It would also be appropriate to cite the Greek word *pápas*, about which we read in Sophocles (*Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*, p. 839): "PAPA, *father*, a title given to bishops in general, and to those of Alexandria and Rome in particular." The Roman "Pope" (Italian *papa*, French *pape*) has retained his title up to the present day. This sort of designation certainly came from Judaism into Christianity. This circumstance might have been made use of by Prof. Büchler to show, that those priests, or, as he expresses himself, those men are called "father" who stood in some relation to the sanctuary.

But in truth neither from this, nor from the proofs adduced by

¹ *II Jahresbericht der israelitisch-theologischen Lehranstalt in Wien*, 1894, 1895.

² *Monatsschrift für Geschichte & Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, XL, 138-144.

³ *Revue des Études Juives*, XXXI, 143-154.

⁴ The citation of verse 10 is probably only a *lapsus*, for nothing can be found there referring to this subject.

Prof. Büchler, can this inference be drawn. It is so very natural to address a beloved and revered person as father, that there is really no necessity to look for a reason. We have the example of Elisha, who calls the prophet Elijah his father (2 Kings ii. 12). Besides, it appears to me, that this custom still obtains at the present day in Eastern countries¹. It may of course be asked why the title of אבא was given to certain persons only, and not to the great multitude of Doctors of the Law. This I consider to be an idle question, because there is no suitable answer to it. For my friend Prof. Büchler is mistaken when he thinks that the persons named by him bore the title all through from the beginning to the end. Thus, for instance, it is not true that Jose b. Dosithai² had no other title but that of אבא, for in Genesis Rabba, c. 78, 4, he is called ר' יוסי; this passage, like some other, proves moreover that the sayings of Abba Jose do not always bear reference to the sanctuary³. In Deuteron. Rabba, c. 4, 8, and Levit. Rabba, c. 5, 4, a certain אבא יודן is mentioned, who neither was a teacher of the Law nor did he live during the time of the temple. Compare also אבא אנטולי, Jer. Demai, 24 a. In the name אבא ארינא, and also in other cases, אבא is a proper noun⁴. We also find אבא הכהן (Tanchuma, בהעלותו, § 20, ed. Buber), where the priestly office is clearly not designated by אבא.

Consequently I venture to maintain that Prof. Büchler's inferences drawn by him from the title of אבא are as untenable as those which he makes from another idiomatical phenomenon; namely, that Doctors of the Law are mentioned only as בן, followed by the name of the father. The latter conclusions have been completely refuted by Prof. Blau⁵. But even the distinction made by Prof. Blau, that

¹ In a recent work of Deismann, *Bibelstudien* (Marburg, 1895), p. 273, a papyrus is published, where a certain Lycarion called a revered person πατήρ.

² It would be more correct to write *Dōsthai*, for דוסתאי is always written without *Yod*; in the Greek Δοσίθεος the accent is, by reason of *Syncope*, moved to the first syllable. I will here remark, that a Jew Δοσίθεος is already mentioned in the epilogue of the Septuagint to the book of Esther.

³ Vid. Bacher, *Agada der Tanaiten*, II, 388. He quotes there from Midrash Samuel, c. 32, אבי לא שמעיה מפומיה דאבא, which also shows that אבא was merely an expression of veneration.

⁴ Vid. Aruch, s. v. אבא.

⁵ *Revue*, l. c.—Why does not Blau quote the name of *Bar-Kappara*? The name בן קפא is also found in Semachoth, VIII; בן הנשא in Jer. Sanhedrin, 18 c.

in ordinary cases the name of the father only is mentioned, and the name of the scholar himself only then added when it is preceded by the honouring title of "Rabbi"—even this distinction cannot be upheld. For according to my belief people are in ordinary cases called by their own names only, to which subsequently the name of the father may be added. This is usually the case in Greek and Latin, from which languages the existence of the same custom can be proved in reference to persons of the Jewish race. But this is so natural that it requires no proof. It is known that under primitive conditions of culture the descent from the mother's line was principally considered, and then the child most likely added the name of the mother. Why should the Jews, more than others, have suppressed their own names? Why should they have deviated from a custom that was prevalent in the Bible? As a matter of fact they never relinquished that custom; even at the present day in Synagogal rites, they use their own name and that of their father. The fact therefore remains that names like *אלישע בן אבויה*, *יוסי בן יועזר*, *עקביא*, *אלשיש בן אבויה*, *יוסי בן יועזר*, *בן מהלאל*, were customary, and that such as *בן עזאי*, *בן זומא*, &c., were exceptional. The causes for such appellations can be recognized in some cases, but are in the majority of cases unknown.

Valuable informations about the sanctuary of Jerusalem have come down to us from scholars who lived in Sepphoris. Prof. Büchler attempts to prove that many distinguished families of priests had fled from the warlike Jerusalem to Sepphoris. He chiefly relies on the genealogy (*מגלת יוחסין*) which had been found in Jerusalem (Jer. Taanith, 68 a; Genesis Rabba, c. 98, 8), in which we also find *בן יהודה מן צפרין*. The whole argument is based upon this notice. Herr Epstein¹ had already pointed out that this passage is corrupt. Unfortunately, neither Herr Epstein nor Prof. Büchler has noticed that this passage of *מגלת יוחסין* occurs also in Mishna Arachin, II, 4, and Tosifta Arachin, I, 15². In the Tosifta we read *בית צפרייא מימאס*³, which means, "The house *Sippor* is from Emmaus⁴." It is known that Emmaus lay in the province of Judaea⁵; thus the passage means

¹ *Monatsschrift*, l. c., p. 141.

² Epstein quotes Strashun ad loc. (*חרושי הרש"ש* in ed. Wilna, 1884), without noticing that Strashun had already the correct notion that the notice in *מגלת יוחסין* had to be combined with Mishna and Tosifta Arachin.

³ *מימאס* (in the ordinary editions of the Mishna) is, of course, a corruption of *אמאס*, v. Rappoport, *ערך מלין*, p. 112. Prof. Büchler disregarded Rappoport's discussion; the passage from the Mishna he quotes p. 181, n. 2.

⁴ The Aramaic *צפרייא* corresponds with the Hebrew *צפרין*.

⁵ Vid. Graetz, *Monatsschrift*, 1853, p. 112, who rightly distinguishes Emmaus

to say that "the house of *Sippor* is from Judaea." The passage in *Jerushalmi* will therefore have to be inverted; instead of *בן יהודה מן צפורין* read *בן צפור מן יהודה*¹, and in *Genesis Rabba*, instead of *דבית צפורין מן יהודה* read *דבית יהוא מן צפורין*². This notice would thus be fully borne out by those of the *Mishna* and *Tosifta*. This would also raise a difficulty mentioned by Herr Epstein; namely, that in a genealogy the names of ancestors must be expected rather than those of the places where the people lived. According to our assumption, the passage really says, that the house of *Sippor* was descended from the tribe of Judah, and is thus in conformity with the other portions of the genealogy.

Prof. Büchler further asserts that there was a Synagogue in *Sepphoris* which was called the Babylonian Synagogue (*כנישתא דבבל*) (*רצפורין*). I may as well mention first that besides the passages quoted by Prof. Büchler, *Jer. Megillah*, 75 b, must be cited. Based on this, Prof. Büchler would prefer to read in *Jer. Taanith*, 64 a, and *Jer. Nazir*, 56 c, *כנישתא דבבלי* instead of *כנישתא דבולי*³. I cannot accept this opinion. I consider *בולי* as a proper noun, the Greek *Βουλῆ*, a town in the south of Judaea. I rely on the passage in *Jer. Aboda Zara*, 43 b: *צלמא דבולי*, where only a town can be meant. In connexion with this I mention that there were in the south of Judaea twenty-four such towns, which had a Greek form of government, and were for this reason called *βουλαί*, *Jer. Nedarim*, 38 a, and *Jer. Shebnoth*, 34 d, *כ"ד בוליות היו בדרים*⁴. It is said that they were destroyed—it seems in the war of Hadrian against Bar-Cochba—on account of the careless oaths of their inhabitants. The sin of indifference in the matter of oaths is also mentioned in other sources; thus, in *Tanchuma*, old edition, § 7 ויקרא; *Tanchuma*, ed. Buber, § 16, and *Numeri Rabba*, c. 22, 1; only in these passages a thousand cities⁵ are mentioned, which were said to have lain in "the mountain of the King" (*הר המלך*). We know also from

in the South of Judaea from Emmaus near Tiberias. The place is now called *Amwās*. Vid. Boettcher, *Lexicon zu Josephus Flavius*, p. 111.

¹ Or *בית צפורין מן יהודה*.

² It is known that *יהודה* was also written for *יהודה*.

³ Strashun, in *Genesis Rabba*, c. 52, 4, quotes the reading *כנישתא דצפורין* instead of *כנישתא דבבלי*.

⁴ For this we read in *Pesikta Rabbathi*, c. 22, p. 41 a, ed. Friedmann אלו; cf. *Abodh di R. Nathan*, version I, c. 20, p. 72, ed. Schechter.

⁵ Always *עיריות*. The number may have its origin in an erroneous transcription of *רביא*, out of *כר*, and then 20,000 cities were spoken of; vid. *Threni Rabba*, II, 2.

other sources that the war of Hadrian had raged particularly in "the mountain of the King"; there is, therefore, an historical substratum in this narrative. It is, however, nowhere said that the destruction originated with the Romans; the matter seems rather to have been brought about in this way, that those cities, for reason of their Greek customs, were rather disliked by the warriors for the national cause, and that the first work of the Bar-Cochba revolt had been to punish them. Similar frictions between the Jewish and Hellenistic population of Palestine are also otherwise historically attested. The crime committed by these cities was perhaps not the taking of an unnecessary oath, but a criminal breach of faith¹.

Prof. Büchler further deals with the question as to the language spoken by the priests of Jerusalem during the last decennium of its existence². In reference to this much ventilated question, Prof. Büchler comes to the conclusion that before 63³ the official language of the priests had been Aramaic, in accordance with the conditions of the time, but that after 63 it had been Hebrew, under the influence of the Pharisees. Here also Prof. Büchler's arguments are not of sufficient force. He relies on the account as to the divine voice heard by the High Priest Simon in the sanctuary speaking *in the Aramaic language* (ובלשון ארמי שמעון). Prof. Büchler lays particular stress on these words, but it escaped him that the same words are also used, on an occasion where there is no question either of sanctuary or of priests⁴. The reason of the Aramaic being used in the narrative does not lie in the circumstance that the priests spoke that language, but in the fact that such was the historical style of the time⁵. As a further proof I will only mention that we have an *Aramaic* account about the High Priest Simon referring to quite an ordinary event (Pesikta Rabbathi, c. 14, p. 65 a, ed. Friedmann, and parallel passages). Prof. Büchler thinks everywhere of priests; thus he could also have applied in proof of his proposition the passage in Joma, 18 a, where we are told in *Aramaic* that Martha, the daughter of Boethus, had

¹ The בולאות שבדורא are reproached for their great pride in Gittin, 37 a. That בולאות should mean *rich people* is a misunderstanding (W. Bacher, *Agada der Tanaiten*, I, 57, note 3). The most unmistakable passage occurs in Semachoth, c. 8, פסוקי בולאות שבדורא, followed immediately by the word קירקסאור (circus).

² Pages 60-67.

³ The year 63 B.C. is according to Prof. Büchler a turning-point in the history of the Temple Worship.

⁴ Semachoth, c. 8 בולשון ארמית אמרן; I consider these words to be authentic, although they are absent in Sanhedrin, 11 a; cf. Jer. Sanhedrin, 18 c.

⁵ Vid. my observation in *Revue des Études Juives*, XXX, 217.

sent the king Jannaeus two *Kab* of Denars, because he had appointed Josuah ben Gamla High Priest. (Vid. Tosafoth, *ibid.*; cf. Tosifta Joma, I, 14, and Threni Rabba, c. 9, 16.) Prof. Büchler thinks that this account is *Aramaic*, because it speaks about a priest. But I am of opinion that we have here a fragment from a lost historical work. We must remember that the Scroll of the Fasts (מגילת תענית) was also composed in *Aramaic*. The insufficiency of Prof. Büchler's argumentation is characterized by the circumstance that he draws important inferences from the single word בִּרְקָאִי in Mishna Joma, III, 1, and Tamid, II, 2, a word, the meaning of which is by no means certain.

Prof. Büchler's attention is directed to everything which bears even the slightest reference to priests. Thus he attempts to prove, that priests married usually only girls of priestly descent¹. I consider this statement to be fully proved. Prof. Büchler cites himself (p. 16) the Talmudical account, according to which eighty pairs of priestly brothers married in one night eighty pairs of sisters descended from priests. It is all the more remarkable that Prof. Büchler does not utilize the passage in proof of his proposition². I myself might adduce an additional strong proof for the statement. Namely, in Levit. Rabba, c. 20, 10, we find that the children of the high priests were particularly careful in the choice of their wives (ר' לוי) אמר . . . מה היו אומרים . . . אבינן כהן גדול ואנו שני סגני כהונה אי אומר . . . אשה הוננת לנו, cf. Tanchuma, אחרי, § 6, p. 156 b, ed. Buber, Pesikta, 172 b, ed. Buber, Midrash Psalm lxxviii. 18)³. There are, however, also examples of Israelite (non-priestly) maidens being married to priests (in the above-cited Mishna Arachin, II, 4)⁴. Here it ought to have been mentioned that this fact was not generally recognized, for R. Chanina b. Antigonos says differently. It can, however, be pointed out, that, according to Tosifta, Aboda Zara, III, 10, Rabban Gamliel I gave his daughter to the priest Simon ben Nethanel for a wife⁵.

Prof. Büchler conjectures that with the expression קדושה ערה

¹ It is true Prof. Büchler speaks only of high priests, but the proposition can also be extended to common priests.

² The legendary character of the narrative does not prevent Prof. Büchler from utilizing it on another occasion.

³ The references given by Herr Epstein, l. c., p. 142, note 1, must be supplemented by these passages.

⁴ Not priests of high standing, as Prof. Büchler thinks, but priests generally are named here.

⁵ Prof. Büchler cites the passage himself, p. 14, note 2.

a community of priests is meant. Prof. Büchler's expositions are, in respect to this, very happy, and throw a correct light upon a number of data. Blau has strengthened Prof. Büchler's opinion with numerous fresh data¹. I may be allowed here to make myself an observation: In Mishna Eduyoth, VII, 8 (cf. M. Kelim, V, 5), מִנְחָם בֶּן סַנְנַאי is mentioned (Tosifta Eduyoth, III, 1, סַנְנַאי, Var פִּיבִינִי). He seems to be the same as מִנְחָם בֶּן סִימְאִי, in Pesachim, 104 a, who is surnamed בֶּן שְׁלֵ קְדוּשִׁים, "the son of holy ones²." The surname, the reason for which is given in so peculiar a manner³, seems to me to have been derived from the father's name; סַנְנַאי is the Greek proper noun Ἄγνος⁴, equal to the adjective ἁγνός, *holy*. The form סַנְנַאי was taken for a plural, and thus בֶּן סַנְנַאי became בֶּן קְדוּשִׁים. Menahem, to judge from his decisions, was a priest, and it is probably owing to this circumstance that popular etymology took hold of his name and made a saint of him. For the present I give this with all reserve, although I think this is on the right track. Further I observe, that Blau's assertion, that the expression חֲסִיד does not apply to the priestly character, is evident from the following passages: Sanhedrin, 11 a (several times חֲסִיד (הי חסיד); Sabbath, 127 b, מַעֲשֵׂה בַחֲסִיד אֶחָד, The

I now turn to one of the boldest assertions of Prof. Büchler's, namely, that the so-called Woes in the Gospel of Matthew (c. xxiii) are directed against the priests, although in the chapter in question no priests, but Pharisees and Doctors of the Law, are mentioned. Herr Epstein rightly rejects this impossible assertion, and refutes it with undeniable proofs. Another proof against this statement, and, in my opinion, not less undeniable, lies in the words πλατύνουσιν γὰρ τὰ φυλακτήρια αὐτῶν, "they enlarge the phylacteries" (verse 5). We know from the whole Talmudical literature that the wearing of the *Tefillin* is a characteristic Pharisaical institution⁵. The same is also evident in Jerome's works⁶. It might be asserted *a priori*, that the priests, who more inclined towards Sadducism, did not wear the phylacteries. But we have even information about it *expressis verbis*. The Talmud says it expressly of the תְּפִלִּין שֶׁל יָד, of the *Tefillin* to be worn on the arm: והני כהנים הואיל וליתנהו במצוה דיד, Arachin, 3 b; but the

¹ *Revue*, l. c., p. 150.

² Vid. Braunschweiger, *Lehrer der Mishna*, p. 178, note 1.

³ R. Samuel b. Meir was not aware of the reason.

⁴ Fick, *Griechische Personennamen*, p. 5, mentions Ἄγνος, Ἀγνιάς, Ἀγνώ, Ἀγνων; all from ἁγνός, *holy*.

⁵ Prof. Büchler does not touch upon this point; but I cannot suppose that he would divide the chapter, which evidently forms one whole.

⁶ Vid. my essay in this *REVIEW*, VII, 238.

priests did not wear them on the head either, because they were covered by the ציץ, or מצנפת. If the matter is treated critically, it appears from the discussion of the Talmud, that the priests did not wear any phylacteries at all; it seems that the Mishna first obliged them to do so. But ציצית and תפלין have the same fate, and presuppose the same data; consequently, we can maintain, that the priests did not wear the fringes either. For this reason alone Matthew, xxiii, cannot refer to the priests.

Prof. Büchler makes a very minute and valuable investigation about the officials of the temple. Among these the אמרכל is frequently mentioned. For the purpose of fixing the character of that dignity, Prof. Büchler quotes Targum Jonathan to Isaiah xxii. 23, where we find: ואממניה אמרכל מהימן ואתן מפתח בית מקדשא ושולטן בית דויד ביריה. Prof. Büchler observes to this: "which says, that the key of the sanctuary was in the hands of a dignitary who was called *Amarkol*" (p. 94). But I see that the Targum says more than this, for the words: "The dominion of the house of David in his hand" (על שכמו, in the text only), cannot possibly mean a simple temple official, like the *Amarkol*. But Prof. Büchler takes no notice of these words of the Targum, although these very words carry us back to the source of the Targum. For in Leviticus Rabba, c. 5, 5, the same verse of scripture is the subject of a controversy. R. Eleazar holds that Shebna had been a high priest, but R. Jehudah maintains that he had been an *Amarkol*. Now, as it is frequently the case¹, both opinions are blended together in Targum Jonathan: מפתח &c. refers to the *Amarkol*, שולטן &c. refers to the high priest. In view of this freedom of treatment, the Targum cannot justly be called sufficient evidence. The passage in the Midrash shows, however, that the *Amarkol* took part in the affairs of the sanctuary, but not in the offering up of the sacrifices²; consequently, he was not a priest, but an Israelite (layman). For all these reasons I cannot admit Prof. Büchler's concluding words that he had correctly discerned the position and signification of the *Amarkol*, although I am unable to substitute another theory of my own. Prof. Büchler himself remarks, that the Targum of the Prophets renders the word יוצר = treasurer, in Zech. xi. 13, with *Amarkol*, although we should have expected נזבר; but we cannot urge closely paraphrastic interpretations. I am surprised that Prof. Büchler does not think it worth while to prove, in respect to the word נזבר, that it

¹ Prof. Büchler, on another occasion, also speaks of a double translation (p. 100).

² Difference between קרבנות and הקדשות.

denoted a priestly office. Taanith, 29 a, proves nothing, for there מְבָרֵךְ is to be taken metaphorically, and not literally, as Prof. Büchler himself admits.

Nor can I agree that it was proved that the ראש המעמד was a priestly person; the "plain and evident result"¹ is rather that the first man of the division was a layman. This is not contradicted either by Sifre, Numbers, § 9, or by Sifra, Lev. xiv. 11. For in the former passage it is not said that the priest was assigned to render the service; but only, that the action be performed under the supervision of the priest; and, according to this, the other passage must be explained in the same way².

The opinion that בעל הפיל (Tosifta, Kelim, Baba Kama, I, 6, p. 569, ed. Zuckermann) denoted a dignitary in the temple, I consider to be altogether erroneous. Prof. Büchler does not examine the word itself³; moreover, he omits to show a connexion between the word and its meaning as adopted by him. In my opinion, בעל הפיל is probably nothing else but "the man of the bean (*fabus*)"; i. e. the ancestor of the house of *Fabius* (פִּיאָבִי or פִּאָבִי), vid. Perles, *Beiträge zur rabbinischen Sprach- und Sagenkunde*, p. 6. Some proof for this assumption may lie in the circumstance that in Mishna Taharoth, VII, 9, some books read בן פִּיאָבִי instead of בן פִּילָא.

I observe besides that important and detailed notices on the composition of the משמר are found in Jer. Taanith, 68 a, which have not been made use of by Prof. Büchler. Among other things, it is said there that the Chiefs of the Order (משמר) were sometimes degraded to Chiefs of Families (עצמן בתי) ועשו משמרות ועשו עצמן בתי (אבות).

A leading idea of Prof. Büchler's, which goes through the whole work, is this, that the Pharisees were suspicious of the priests, and therefore superintended the latter. Thus he writes: "Unequivocal and fully reliable traditions, which we are soon going to consider, put it beyond doubt, that the presence of non-priestly elders at the sacerdotal performances was not an ancient custom and settled usage, but has to be counted among the rights obtained by the Pharisaical side during the last decennium of the existence of the Temple." This idea may be correct in itself; but I think, it also ought to have been mentioned, that the presence of non-priestly elders was not a right obtained by the Pharisees, but the assist-

¹ Prof. Büchler's own words, p. 92.

² Prof. Büchler gives a good instance of this also, cf. his remark on Mishna Zebachim, IX, 3 (p. 70, note 4).

³ Page 98, where the subject is dealt with in an off-hand manner.

ance rendered by the teachers of the Law, versed in the Halacha, to priests who lacked such training. This idea is quite plainly expressed in traditional literature¹, and the sources display evidence of a calm treatment of the subject, and that they give no indication whatever that any struggle had taken place.

Prof. Büchler then speaks of the connexion between priests and Levites. At the very commencement he meets with a difficulty (p. 119); namely, the letter of Antiochus the Great, communicated by Josephus, mentions the teachers of the law of the temple (καὶ γραμματεῖς τοῦ ἱεροῦ)², who, according to the context, could only have been Levites. Prof. Büchler sees a difficulty in this, that nothing similar is to be found in the literature of the Talmud and Midrash. Against this I draw attention to the frequently expressed view, according to which the teachers were of the tribe of Levi³; and more especially to the remarkable circumstance, that Moses, the chief of the Levites, is, in two places, very emphatically called Israel's teacher of the law (ספרא רבא דישׂראל, Sotah, 13 b)⁴.

Prof. Büchler collects on this occasion several data, which prove that the singing in the temple was done by the priests; but Prof. Büchler cannot acquiesce in this, and vindicates, in spite of this, the singing in the temple by the Levites. This opinion, which is meant to agree with the Halacha, is really opposed to it; for according to the latter, priests, Levites, and Israelites had to participate in the singing *without fail*. (Jer. Taanith, 67 d: חני ר"ש הכהנים והלויים; וישראל וישר מעבבין את הקרבן שיר, where the word שיר refers to all three categories, as the discussion there proves⁵. This of course would not mean to say that there was not any singing which was reserved exclusively for the Levites.

Prof. Büchler does not mention with a single word⁶ that the Levites were also divided into orders (משמרות), and yet this is evident from the words of R. Jose b. Chanina in Jer. Megillah, 73 b: מיכן

¹ Numeri Rabba, c. 11, 3: הלמדי חכמים המלמדים את הכהנים הלכות שחיטה וקבלה; &c. ² Ibid. c. 11, 3: וזריקה וקמיצה כיון; &c. ³ Ibid. c. 11, 3: שהיו מלמדין לכהנים היאך יעשו עבודה. ⁴ Ibid. c. 11, 3: שהיו מלמדין לכהנים היאך יעשו עבודה. ⁵ Ibid. c. 11, 3: שהיו מלמדין לכהנים היאך יעשו עבודה. ⁶ Ibid. c. 11, 3: שהיו מלמדין לכהנים היאך יעשו עבודה. The same also Cantieum Rabba, III, 6. I do not want to examine the historical value of these notices; but so much is certain that the co-operation of the "Pharisees" appears here in quite a different light. Cf. also the important passage in Sifre, Numbers, § 116: הרי זו אזהרה; &c.

² Büchler translates "scribes," but it means "teachers of the law."

³ In connexion with Genesis xlix. 7.

⁴ Prof. Bacher pointed out to me that these words are also found in Targum Onkelos to Deuteronomy xxxiii. 21.

⁵ See Prof. Büchler, p. 127, on the singing by laymen.

⁶ Cf. Blau, l. c., p. 151.

למשמרות כהונה ולויה שיהיו בטילין further, Numeri Rabbi and Canticum Rabba, l. c. : כ"ד משמרות כהונה וכ"ד משמרות לויה ¹, and Ezra vii. 9 ².

Prof. Büchler further discusses the place where the Levites stood. He considers as such the frequently-mentioned "raised place" רוכן, in opposition to Graetz, who says that this was the place where the priests stood ³. On this point, I think I must agree with Prof. Büchler. For there is, in the ordinary prayer-books, a רבון העולמים after the פרשת הקרבנות, in which, among other things, is mentioned כהנים בעבודתם ולוים בדוכנם וישראל במעמדם; and a little later we read: ולא לוי בדוכנו. This is enough to place Prof. Büchler's opinion beyond doubt. I attribute some authority to this prayer ⁴, because a prayer of this class is based, as a rule, upon some Rabbinical source, and it may be that the above words are taken from the Talmud. But, speaking of the prayer-book, I will only add that the words ולוים בשירם ובמורם, in the Musaph-prayer of the three principal festivals, also seem to indicate what I said before, namely, that the Levites participated in two sorts of singing.

I may now be allowed to make a few observations on the particular way in which the so-called twenty-four orders (כ"ד משמרות) were constituted; and I should say at once that Blau does not properly call the order consisting of Israelites (laymen) "Mishmar" ⁵, for the Talmud, in the passage quoted by Blau, always used the expression עמוד, *Ammud*, and the term for this is always only מעמד, *Maamad*. The difference between the two expressions is this, that מעמד always means the order of Israelites only (Jer. Taanit, 67 d, המעמדות מתכנסין, (ישראל), and further on always only ישראל), whilst עמוד was the order consisting of Cohanim, Levites, and Israelites. An order of the latter kind was always present in Jerusalem during the service (ibidem: ועל כל משמר ומשמר היה עמוד בירושלים של כהנים של לוים ושל ישראלים). Then follows immediately: "It has been taught: twenty-four thousand" ⁶, i. e. the just-mentioned order consisted of a body of priests, Levites, and Israelites, to the number of 24,000 men. The members of this order were convened from the whole of Palestine. The Baraitha continues: עמוד מירושלים וחצי עמוד מיריחו, "from Jerusalem only a whole Ammud (24,000) could be drafted." This means that Jerusalem always contained such a population of priests, Levites,

¹ Cf. Threni Rabba, Introduction, No. 23, משמרות כהונה ולויה.

² Quoted by Prof. Büchler, p. 137.

³ Page 126.

⁴ In the edition of Salomon (Zalmon) London, Vienna, 1857, this prayer is printed on p. 20.

⁵ *Revue*, l. c., p. 151.

⁶ חצי עשרים וארבעה אלף.

and Israelites, that an Ammud could always be formed from them, and Jericho also contained so many people as to suffice for half an Ammud. This may really have been so. Then a small exaggeration follows. "Jericho could also have furnished a complete Ammud, but it sent only half an Ammud, in order to preserve Jerusalem's prerogative." The words following next form the natural complement: "The priests for the service, the Levites for the Duchan¹; the Israelites, on the other hand, prove *per se* that they were the deputies from the whole of Israel." This means that it was not necessary to bring up to Jerusalem, from the whole of Palestine, the Israelite portion of the Ammud—besides, this would have been an impossibility, for, in that case, it would have been just as necessary to summon deputies from Egypt and Babylonia and from the Jews of other countries—but the mere fact that there were also Israelites in the Ammud, gives it the character of a representation of the whole of Israel. This I believe gives a clear meaning to the whole passage, and it is unnecessary to amend it in any way, as Blau has, not very happily, attempted to do.

In further laying stress upon the difference between Mishmar and Ammud, I am unable to accept Blau's opinion that the Baraitha contained in Bab. Taanit, 27 a, was only another edition of the above-mentioned Baraitha, and was to be modified accordingly. The Baraitha, as contained in the Babylonian Talmud, exhibits, to my mind, no difficulties, although Epstein² does not see his way clear about it. We give a translation: "There are twenty-four Mishmars in Jerusalem, twelve of which were in Jericho³; when the turn of a Mishmar came round to go up [to Jerusalem], the one half of a Mishmar went up from Palestine to Jerusalem⁴, and the other half of a Mishmar went up from Jericho, and for the reason, to enable them to provide drink and food to their brethren in Jerusalem." Namely, there was in Jericho a large colony of priests, who occupied themselves with agriculture; therefore it was ordained, that of the Mishmars of the country—with the exclusion of Jericho—always one half,—and of the Mishmar of Jericho likewise one half went up to Jerusalem. Accordingly, the rest of Palestine, as well as Jericho, sent

¹ This passage also proves that the Levites used to stand upon the רוקן.

² *Monatsschrift*, l. c., p. 144.

³ As if it were written ומהם שנים עשרה ביריחו, as the Talmud correctly explains.

⁴ The words מארץ ישראל לירושלים, which would be superfluous, plainly say that always one half of a Mishmar, scattered over all Palestine, went up.

twenty-four times a year one half of a Mishmar to Jerusalem. I do not see why such an arrangement could not have been made, by means of which it was even possible to distribute systematically every Mishmar over the whole country and over Jericho, and which would thus cause no difficulty. Prof. Büchler has been able to understand this Baraitha, and also the one in Jerusalem in which he proposes a small alteration only. I think even this to be unnecessary; much more so the alterations of Epstein and Blau.

In conclusion, I observe that the Baraitha discussed by Blau, which treats of the four families of priests, is also found in Jer. Taanit, 68 a.

I made these observations, partly when I first read Prof. Büchler's work, and partly on reading the said reviews. I have not treated the matter systematically, and this may be my excuse, that I publish here only stray notes, and not a finished essay.

SAMUEL KRAUSS.

ZADOC KAHN'S SERMONS.

Sermons et Allocutions adressés à la jeunesse israélite, par ZADOC KAHN, Grand-Rabbin de France. (Paris: Durlacher, 1896.)

M. ZADOC KAHN's reputation as a preacher deservedly stands high among his own countrymen, and several of his sermons which have found their way across the channel have attracted attention here.

The volume under consideration is a new edition of a work which originally appeared in 1877. It consists of a collection of sermons and addresses delivered to children, or to adults on topics connected with childhood. But it is more than a mere reprint, for it contains some addresses which do not figure in the earlier edition, and which are now printed for the first time. The volume might have been conveniently divided into two parts, Part I (pp. 1-162) comprising nine sermons, Part II (pp. 163-293) containing fifteen addresses on special occasions.

The author states what he regards as the ideal method to be adopted by the preacher to children. In the course of an excellent sermon, entitled "Be Young," he feels for a moment that he is talking above the heads of his young auditors, and exclaims: "However, I must not lose sight of the fact that after all you are children, and that it behoves me to speak to you in a language adapted to your